



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the images of Christ, and of the Mother of God, always virgin, and of other saints, are to be had and retained, and that to them due honour and veneration is to be given."

This is, indeed, a sad and melancholy contrast! The Word of God says—"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image." Pope Pius IV. says—"I most firmly assert that images are to be had and retained." The Almighty declares—"Thou shalt not bow down unto them or worship them." The Church of Rome asserts that "due honour and veneration" is to be given to images. What may be the precise nature or amount of this "due honour and veneration" is not indeed stated; but those who are familiar with the customs prevalent in Roman Catholic countries, and especially in Italy, must have a painful recollection of the universal prevalence of image worship, avowedly and without disguise. Nay, the very language of the Creed of Pope Pius IV. would almost lead us to expect as much. In it, Roman Catholics are taught to believe in God "with a firm faith" (*firma fide*), but "to assert most firmly" (*firmissime*) the lawfulness of image worship. Thus the Church of Rome, if we are to believe the language of this Creed, teaches her members to believe more firmly in the lawfulness of image worship than in the existence of God himself! Is this the manner in which she practically trains them "to abstain from all appearance of evil?" We fear that, with the Creed of Pope Pius IV. in our hands, and the practice of the great majority of Roman Catholics before our eyes, we cannot acquit the Church of Rome of a criminal negligence, in not guarding her followers, by adequate means, against the plain and open breach of the Second Commandment.

We know, of course, the plea by which the practice of image worship in the Roman Catholic Church is usually defended—namely, that the worship, whatever it be, which is paid to the image, passes on to the being whom the image is intended to represent. We shall hereafter take occasion to point out the great difficulties and objections which stand in the way of this theory, and which have been acknowledged even by Roman Catholic divines; but at present we may observe that the plea, such as it is, leaves the greater part of the charge we have made unanswered. The Second Commandment, as we have seen, distinctly forbids three things—viz., the making of images for religious uses, the bowing down to them, the inward adoration of them. Now, we cannot tell what passes in a man's mind as he offers up his prayers before an image; his thoughts may, for aught we know, be directed to Christ or the Virgin Mary, or they may rest directly on the image itself; but his outward gestures are open to observation; and when we see him bowing down before the image, and addressing religious reverence to it, we cannot but conclude that he is either ignorant of, or that he altogether rejects the plain command of Almighty God—"Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image—thou shalt not bow down to it, nor serve it."

And there is one fact which seems to prove very conclusively that the heads of the Church of Rome are quite conscious that their practice of image worship cannot stand the test of Scripture—namely, the almost universal omission of the Second Commandment from the popular Roman Catholic catechisms (*). Why, we may well ask, are the Roman Catholic clergy so anxious to keep back the knowledge of the existence of this commandment from the children whom they instruct, unless they are afraid that doubts will be excited in their young minds by the sight of images in their churches and chapels, if they should discover that the Word of God expressly condemns *all* image worship? When the Almighty gave the Ten Commandments to the Israelites, "he wrote them upon two tables of stone" (Deut. v. 22), and he charged the people "to teach them diligently unto their children."—Deut. vi. 7. Every jot and tittle of these laws ought to be held in the highest reverence. If we feel any regard for what the Almighty has commanded, surely the words which were written by the finger of God himself ought to be carefully treasured up in the memory, and implicitly obeyed by all, whether young or old. And yet, in the common Roman Catholic catechisms, the Second Commandment is either wholly omitted, or else cut down to one small fragment! We again ask, *why* is this done? The Church of England is not afraid to teach her children all the counsel of God. She does not dare to mutilate the solemn words which the Lord saw fit to make known to his people in such a miraculous manner. The authorized catechism in the Prayer-book of the United Church of England and Ireland, contains the whole Ten Commandments without curtailment or alteration. That church, at any rate, is not afraid of the light.

We have seen that the Creed of Pope Pius IV. declares that "due honour" is to be given to images; and the Council of Trent makes the same assertion (*). But what is this "due honour?" Why did not the learned Fathers of the Council, or the infallible Pontiff,

leave more precise directions upon this point? Their silence, we apprehend, proceeded as much from fear of betraying the weakness of their cause as from any other motive: for this is one of the knotty points relating to the worship of images which, however it be decided, must, according to Roman Catholic divines, inevitably lead to idolatry, as we shall now proceed to prove. In the theology of the Church of Rome, *Latria* is the name given to the worship which is due to God alone. Let us suppose that there is an image of Jesus Christ before us; the question is, are we to worship this image with *Latria*, or are we not? No, says Bellarmine, we are not; and here are his reasons (6):—"No image is to be worshipped properly with that worship which the thing represented is worshipped by; for *Latria* is a worship proper to God; but no image, upon account of relation, or any other way, is God. Therefore, that worship doth not belong to it. Again, either the Divine worship, or *Latria*, which is given to the image relatively for another, is the same with that which is given to God, or an inferior worship. *If it be the same, the creature is equally worshipped with God, which certainly is idolatry. For idolatry is not only when God is forsaken, and an idol worshipped, but when an idol is worshipped together with God.* If it be an inferior worship, then that is not *Latria*, for that is the highest worship." Thus far Bellarmine. On the other side, Vasquez, a Jesuit, a man of as great reputation and ability as Bellarmine, decides exactly the opposite way—namely, that we are to worship the image with *Latria*. (7) "For," saith he, "if an inferior worship be given to the image, distinct from that which is given to the thing represented, *he that so gives it incurs the crime of idolatry*, for he expresses his submission to a mere inanimate thing, that hath no kind of excellency to deserve it from him." We may now put the question to our Roman Catholic readers, what are they to do? If they worship the image of Jesus Christ with *Latria*, they are guilty of downright idolatry, according to Cardinal Bellarmine, for they are giving to an image that worship which is due to God alone. If they do *not* worship the image with *Latria*, they are worshipping it for its own sake, by which, according to the Jesuit Vasquez, they incur the crime of idolatry. We see, then, that if they worship the image at all, in no possible way can they avoid the crime of idolatry, according to the opinion of the most eminent Roman Catholic divines. Here then, surely, is a question, if there be any, upon which the infallible guidance of the Supreme Pontiff is needed, in order to save faithful members of the Church of Rome from falling into deadly sin. But what say the Council of Trent and Pope Pius IV.? They reply, as we have seen, that "due honour" is to be given to the image—in short, they leave the difficulty where they found it! Where, we may well ask, is the boasted unity of Roman Catholic divines upon one of the most important articles of their faith? Where is the benefit which they derive from an infallible head, if it cannot help them out of a difficulty which nearly touches their eternal salvation, and which has been acutely felt by the greatest champions of their creed?

We make no pretensions to infallibility; and yet we venture to think that we can give our Roman Catholic friends safer advice than either Pope Pius IV., Cardinal Bellarmine, or the Jesuit Vasquez. It is simply this, to abstain altogether from the practice of image worship, which, even according to the statements of its most illustrious advocates, is encompassed with such awful perils. The sin of idolatry is too great, that we should rashly venture upon any practice which may, however unwittingly, lead us into such a grievous transgression against the honour and majesty of Almighty God.

We have not space at present to enter upon an examination of the arguments by which the practice of image worship has been palliated or defended, nor to trace the history of the rise and progress of this corruption of the primitive faith. We hope, however, to take an early opportunity of returning to the subject; and we shall then present our readers with such an extraordinary picture of the inconsistencies, vacillation, and contradictions of Popes and Councils upon this matter, as may well startle the most stubborn believer in the unity and immutability of the Church of Rome.

TALK OF THE ROAD—NO. VIII.

"Oh, Jem, where have you been all this time?"

"Why, Pat, I got a job down to Roscommon, to drive up some cattle, and I only got back last night," said Jem.

"Well, it's I that's wishing to have a talk with you, Jem," said Pat.

"And what is it about?" said Jem.

"Why, sure the readers is come!" said Pat.

"Ah, where are they come?" said Jem.

"Why, into the very town of Kilcommon itself," said Pat.

"Well," said Jem, "if that doesn't beat all! didn't I think, if ever they came down this way, it would

be in some quiet, out of the way place like this they would come, where, maybe, some of us would let them in of an evening unbeknownst; but what will they do in Kilcommon at all?"

"Well, then, it's there they've come," said Pat, "right into Father John's mouth, and facing all the blackguards in Kilcommon; and of all the work ever you see, it's in Kilcommon it is."

"Tell us all about it: will you?" said Jem.

"Well," said Pat, "I looked for a job in Kilcommon last week, for there was nothing to be got here, and, sure enough, I saw the readers the first day they came into the town. And they didn't go about like any readers ever we saw going through the country before; but just like men going about their business in a fair, or in a market; going straight fornest them, into every house, one after the other, and passing none, and talking to the people as open as day, and telling them they had souls to be saved, and that the Word of God, and nothing else, was able to save their souls."

"Well, how did the people take it all?" said Jem.

"Why, then, they took it quite pleasant," said Pat: "they seemed all to be took of a sudden, and it looked so open, they could see no harm in it, and the people were all mighty civil to them; and when I followed them a while after dinner, I saw that there was a deal of the people that was well pleased to talk to them."

"Well, and what was Father John doing at all?" said Jem.

"Why, the next day," says Pat, "Father John comes down just the same way, and goes into every house the readers were in the day before, and 'Where's the books and papers the Ranters left with you?' says he. Well, and sure enough, many of the people that was glad enough to speak to the readers the day before, was just cowed when they saw Father John fornest them, and handed up their books, looking for all the world as if they were going to do penance; and some of them that I knowed took the books, said they never got any; and there was some said out that they liked the books, and found no harm in them, and they weren't going for to give them, and old Jemmy Neal says, says he, 'Sure its only about Irishmen's rights, says he; and aren't we going to have any rights at all?' says he."

"And what were the readers doing that day?" says Jem.

"Why," said Pat, "they began before Father John was out, in another part of the town; and all the time Father John was going over one street, they were going about in another, as pleasant as ever."

"And didn't Father John go after them to where they were?" said Jem.

"Indeed, didn't he," said Pat; "and I was wondering why, for I saw the town sergeant come and tell him where they were, and he didn't go after them a bit; and so I went to see what they were doing, and sure enough they were walking about as bold as you please, and a real clergyman with them, and he with his Douay Bible in his hand, saying, he only wanted to tell the people what was in that, and that if he met Father John he would hold his own tongue, and only hand the book to Father John, and ask him to read some of that, and explain it to the people. And sure enough I didn't wonder that Father John kept out of the street he was in, for that would be new work for Father John."

"Well, and how did it end at all?" said Jem.

"Why, it just went on the same way till Saturday," said Pat; "the readers getting into all the houses quite pleasant, for no one liked to put them out, and Father John running about at the far end of the town, for fear he would meet them; and so it went on till Saturday night. Well, on Sunday morning, says I to myself, I'll just go into the chapel at Kilcommon, where I wasn't, sure enough, for long enough, and I'll hear what Father John has to say about it. Well, of all the scolding and cursing that ever you heard a priest give at the altar it was the terriblest. First he fell on the Ranters, and the Swaddlers, and the Soupers, and the Jumpers, and the unbaptized heathens, and the cockatrices, and the goose-stealers, and a deal more names he had for them; and, sure enough, I wondered why he called them goose-stealers (for them's as decent men as you would see, more like gentlemen than Father John, with all his bad language); till, I saw him turn round to some old women that wor in the chapel, and says he, 'Now you old women there, mind to look after your geese,' says he, for these Soupers are so fond of soup, says he, that when the bacon's out, its stealing your geese they'll be, says he, to make soup of. Well, thinks I to myself, says I, if that's all you have to say against reading the Bible, the readers will have the town yet, thinks I; and with that he went on to Mr. Owens for fetching the readers, and of all the bad names that ever was called, he had the baddest for him. And, says he, when the cholera was in Ireland, their clergy, says he, that's married and has wives, says he, all presented a petition to the Protestant bishop, says he, that they mightn't go to the cholera hospital, says he, but let the Protestants die like dogs, says he. And thinks I to myself that's enough any way; for when I was lying ten days in the cholera hospital, didn't I see Mr. Owens, that has a wife, there three times a day, and never set eyes on Father John,

(4) *Vide* The Abridgement of Christian Doctrine, the Italian Catechism, called "Dottrina Christiana" (Rome, 1836), and other catechisms, *passim*.

(5) *Vide Conc. Trid. Sess. xxv. Imaginibus debitum honorem et venerationem impertiendam.*

(6) *Vide Bellarm. de Imag. lib. ii. cap. 24. vol. iii. pp. 330, 331. Colon. 1615.*

(7) *Vide Vasquez in Xxv. disp. iii. 108; q. 25, art. 3, c. 9.*

if it would keep me out of hell, let alone purgatory? and I saw plain enough there was plenty forby me that considered that. Well, then he came to Mrs. Owens, and if he hadn't the horriest names for her that ever you heard, it's a wonder; and when he got just black in the face with abusing her, it's a fiend out of hell, I was going to call her, says he; and, sure enough, I saw many a poor creature that seemed ashamed to hear Mrs. Owens called that way, for it's she that's good to the poor. Well, then he went on to tell them what to do to the Ranters; and if they would not throw dirty water on them, and gather on them in the street, and hoot them, and sweep up the puddles in their floors in their faces with the besoms, he'd call them on the altar next Sunday, and put the curse of God and his curse on them, and never give them the rights of the church as long as they lived; and so that was Father John's sermon at the blessed altar."

"Well, and what became of it a Monday?" said Jem.

"Why, then, sure enough, I went to see," said Pat; "and what should I see, when the readers came up the street, but up comes Brady, the jammer, with a big hand-bell that Connor, the bell-man, rings in the street when there is an auction; and Brady, the jammer, comes up the street, ringing his bell, and gathering all the blackguards in the street, and sure they are the bad set in Kilcommon, and up he goes to the readers as they were going into a house; and of all the screeching, and cursing, and bad language, and ringing that ever you heard, it beat all."

"And how did the readers take it all?" said Jem.

"Just as pleasant as you please," said Pat; "they had a word to answer for everything, and were never put out, no more than if they were ringing bells themselves all their lives."

"Well, and did the people let them in?" said Jem.

"How durst they," said Pat, "when such a mob was riz on them? But I saw that a deal of them did not like it at all, and went out and listened to the readers and the clergyman quite quiet. But, oh, the jammer: when the clergyman would offer to speak a word to the people, he'd go and ring his bell up at our ear with one hand, and when that was tired with the other hand, at the other ear, screeching himself black in the face; and then the clergyman would say, holding up the Douay Bible in his hand—'Is it your own Bible that you hate, that you treat it that way? Why don't your priest come himself, and show if the book is a bad one?' And, indeed, when the people saw how pleasant and quiet the readers behaved, they thought it bad work, and out comes old Sally Smith, and says she to the jammer, 'Is that what your at, and isn't it yourself that would sell the priest next for a glass of whisky?' And, indeed, I heard after that, that the jammer was hired by Father John, and that he had a pound to put the readers out of Kilcommon, and no cure, no pay. But that's the way it is; and what will come of it, I don't know at all."

"Well, Pat," said Jem, "I'm thinking that if the priest has nothing to say agen the Bible, but dirty water and mud, and shouting, and the ringing of a bell, he'll never put it out of Kilcommon that way. Sure all the boys must see, when they come to think of it, that their religion is in a bad way, when the priest has nothing else to say for it."

"Well, indeed, I'm thinking that's true," said Pat; "but we'll see, and who knows but the readers and the Bible will have Kilcommon yet?"

POPE PIUS V.—CATECHISM OF COUNCIL OF TRENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—I have often been surprised that the vast majority of Roman Catholics, believing themselves to possess an infallible guide, do not more generally refer to the original documents, which alone contain, with certainty, its true teaching. It rarely happens that they go beyond the instructions of their particular spiritual guide, whose fallibility they do not, in theory, deny; but whom yet they thus elevate, in practice, into their only infallible standard. It cannot be expected that all priests should be equally well informed, or should take the same views of their church's doctrines, scattered as they are over so many ponderous and difficult volumes. Hence arise the greatest differences amongst individuals, which seem completely to mar the practical utility to be derived from a common authoritative standard. An instance of this occurs to me as a good example, not that it appears to a Protestant to be on a point of any vital importance, but because it is much insisted on by eminent Roman Catholics divines, and yet seems to be a palpable inconsistency.

The 4th and 5th verses of the 20th chapter of Exodus, which form the second commandment in the Protestant version, and which, though very frequently omitted in catechisms, are yet acknowledged by the Roman Catholic Church as part of the first precept, have lately provoked no small controversy. Our translation is objected to as a wilful perversion; and it is argued that we have introduced the words "graven image" improperly, and to uphold our heretical views on that subject. To those who remember that the next word is

"similitude," or "likeness," it would seem of little moment, as this must include an image; but it is not so treated, and if worth a very warm attack, it deserves a just defence. Dr. Dixon, whose name derives unusual importance from his recent elevation to the Roman Catholic Primacy, published a work, some few months since,* in which he devotes a chapter to the meaning of the two verses, and bases much of his argument on the Protestant mistranslation, or introduction of the word *image*. Dr. Doyle, in his "Abridgement of Christian Doctrine,"† distinctly attributes great weight to this view. The Douay Bible represents the careful opinion of many of the greatest biblical students, and was specially revised by Dr. Murray, and is, therefore, to be taken as the exponent of their opinion on this point, and translates the words in question "*graven thing*."

The only translation usually referred to, as stamped by the Roman Catholic Church with the attribute of infallibility, is the Vulgate, in which the word "*sculptile*" is used, which leaves the controversy open, or rather favours the Douay version. It appears to me, however, that there is another, even (if possible) more authoritative, and certainly more decisive. The Catechism of the Council of Trent has been usually received as the undoubted expression of the church's doctrines, and, if not infallible, has never had its accuracy impeached by Roman Catholic divines. This, too, has been commonly referred to in Latin, and does not, therefore, advance the controversy a step. But, fortunately, I find that there were two editions promulgated simultaneously, both from the Papal press at Rome;‡ both with the same authoritative approval of Pope Pius V., and both in the year 1567. On an inspection of the two, there is no reason to pronounce one of more authority than the other; the one is in Latin, the other in Italian; and, if a preference should be given to either, it should be to that which was in the native language of those who drew it up, and which was, therefore, incapable of error from ambiguity or misunderstanding. Turning, therefore, to the 375th page, we find the commandment thus rendered:—

"Non ti farai alcuna *immagine scolpita*," &c., and farther on, "*non le adorerai, ne le onorerai*."

I need hardly translate words so obvious and unmis-takeable—"Thou shalt not make thee any *sculptured image*." And, again—"Thou shalt not adore them, nor shalt thou honour them." The first needs no comment, and the second expression is no less valuable; for no words are so frequently translated in different forms, and so often disputed, as those that express different kinds of forms of worship. The infallible declaration, therefore, that images are not even to receive a religious honour, seems to me to have been wholly overlooked by Roman Catholic controversialists. As to the introduction of the word "*images*," it suggests this inquiry—Are Dr. Doyle, Dr. Murray, and Dr. Dixon right, and was Pope Pius V. wrong? And, if not, then did not these three learned divines teach incorrectly, on what they said was important? This will surely show that no Roman Catholic should rest satisfied with the mere *ipse dixit* of his priest, however learned, but should refer to the documents which alone he believes infallible.

One word on a feature in this authoritative edition, particularly as it is one that may have tended to cause this very error. The oversight was most natural; for, without a very careful perusal, this text is not likely to be discovered at all. The verses that are given, as constituting the ten commandments, are printed in very large type, quite distinct from the rest of the book, and with a commendable prominence; but this fourth verse, the Protestant second commandment, is omitted in that place and type, though those before and following appear; and any reader would naturally imagine that it did not form any part of the ten commandments. However, some pages afterwards, it is introduced in the commentary, so that it cannot be said it is wholly omitted; but it is so done as not to attract notice, nor to appear a part of the commandment; and not even being placed as a quotation, between inverted commas, it might escape the notice of any reader, who was not previously aware that it was both a verse in the Bible and an integral portion of the decalogue. If this verse escaped the observation of such learned men as the three divines I have named, I may well imagine that I may happen to be the first to now place this important translation before the public.

FONTIUM PETITOR.

THE TOUCHSTONE.

(Continued from page 104.)

OBJECTION 13.—Protestants commonly teach, that people of all religions may be saved, even Pagans, Jews, or Mahometans, that believe not in Christ, nor receive his Gospel.

Their own Bible, in clear and express terms, condemns this error (St. Mark xvi. 16)—*He that believeth not (the Gospel) shall be damned. Acts iv. 12—Neither is*

there salvation in any other; for there is no other name (but the name of Jesus) under heaven given unto men, whereby we must be saved. St. John iii. 36—He that believeth not the Son shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him.

REPLY.—It is plain that the persons here spoken of are such as had had the Gospel preached to them; which some of them received, and others, to their condemnation, rejected.

As for such Pagans as have lived and died without ever having heard the Gospel, no Protestant Church presumes to decide how they will be judged; because Scripture gives us no information on the subject.

But that Protestants consider it a matter of great importance to make known the Gospel to Pagan nations is sufficiently proved by the toils, and dangers, and sufferings which many of their missionaries encounter in that work; and in the zeal and liberality shown by others in sending out and supporting such missionaries.

OBJECTION 14.—Protestants teach that it is not necessary to salvation to embrace the faith and communion of the true church.

Their own Bible teaches the contrary, when it tells us (Acts iv. 47) that *God added daily to the church such as should be saved. And (Isaiah lx. 12) that the nation and kingdom that will not serve (the church) shall perish.*

REPLY.—These passages, it should be observed, make no mention whatever of the *Church of Rome*. Protestants do hold that the Gospel promises are limited to those who are members of the Church of Christ—namely, the universal church—which consists of *all believers* in Christ throughout the whole world. But they do not admit the supremacy claimed by the Church of Rome and by the Greek Church; each of which calls itself the only "*true Church*," and the "*Catholic Church*," and demands submission from all Christians. Let any one try such claims by the Touchstone of Scripture, according to the professed design of this tract. Protestants will admit the claims of the Church of Rome if any passage can be found, either in the Epistle to the Romans or in any other part of Scripture, describing the Church of Rome as supreme over all Christians, and as possessing an authority which all are bound to submit to. A doctrine so very important as this would be, if true, would surely have been mentioned by the Apostles, had they known of any such. But we find them, on the contrary, always speaking of each of the churches—of Ephesus, for instance, and Corinth, and Thessalonica, &c.—as perfectly independent of any one on earth, except the Apostles themselves.

OBJECTION 15.—Protestants look upon it uncharitable to say, that *heresy* is a damnable sin, or that *heretics* are in a state of damnation.

Their own Bible (Gal. v. 20) expressly reckons *heresies* amongst those sins of which it pronounces, *that they who do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God.*

OBJECTION 16.—Protestants are of opinion, that no man shall be damned for following a wrong religion, if he really judges it to be right, whether he have taken sufficient pains to inform himself of the truth or no.

Their own Bible expressly tells them (Prov. xvi. 25), *There is a way that seemeth right unto a man, but the end thereof are the ways of death.*

REPLY to 15, 16.—If you read through the Prayer-book of the Church of England, including the Thirty-nine Articles, you will find no such declaration. And as for what any private individual, Roman Catholic or Protestant, may declare as his own private opinion, this, be it right or wrong, is not to be regarded as a decision of his church.*

The same observation will apply to the 16th objection. But no Protestants deny what the Apostle says at Gal. v. 19, 20, 21, concerning the sins which are there enumerated, among which, along with heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, and many others, they find *idolatry*—that is, adoration of images.

But Protestants do not, in general, presume to pronounce of any individual sinner that he is inevitably doomed to final perdition, and that it is impossible for the Almighty to pardon him; because God alone can perfectly know what opportunities each man has had, and what temptations he has been exposed to. And no Protestant church has ever put forth any such declaration as that contained in objection 16.

If a passage could be cited, from the works of any individual Protestant writer, declaring it as his belief that it is a matter of indifference whether a man have taken due pains to inform himself of the truth or no, this would prove nothing against any other Protestants. But we do not believe that even any one such passage could be found.

OBJECTION 17.—Protestants, to justify their wide notions of salvation in any religion, falsify the Scripture, by forging a text, nowhere to be found, even in their own Bible—viz., *that a remnant of all shall be saved.*

Their own Bible loudly condemns this forgery (Rev. xxii. 18, 19)—*I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, if any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book: and if any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, &c.*

* A General Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures. Duffy, 1852.
† R. Coyne, Dublin. 1846. 49.
‡ Both in Trinity College Library.

* See Eighteenth Article of Church of England.